

NOV 6 1924

# The Classical Weekly

Published weekly, on Monday, except in weeks in which there is a legal or School holiday, from October 1 to May 31, at  
Barnard College, New York City. Subscription price, \$2.00 per volume.  
Entered as second-class matter, November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of  
March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on  
June 28, 1918.

VOL. XVIII, No. 3

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1924

WHOLE No. 480

## GENERAL INDEX

TO

## THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY,

Volumes I-XVI

and

Index to Volume XVII

Bound together in cloth

112 pages

\$1.25<sup>1</sup>

Send orders, with remittance, to

**CHARLES KNAPP,**

1737 Sedgwick Ave.

New York City

<sup>1</sup>This price is open only to those who have subscribed one dollar or more to the cost of the Index I-XVI. To others the price is \$2.25.

### ***Some of Us Like to Experiment, But---***

The Head of the Department of Latin of the Lawrenceville (N. J.) High School wrote—"After experimenting with several first-year Latin books, recommended on the highest terms, I have decided to return to

#### **COLLAR AND DANIELL'S FIRST YEAR LATIN**

I consider it the most satisfactory book for that work". Thousands of teachers concur in this judgment. And you?

### ***Some of Us Stick to Our First Choice---***

The Head of the Department of Latin of the Eastern District High School, Brooklyn, N. Y., says that "It is always a pleasure to speak well of a good book. Having used in this school

#### **D'OOGHE AND EASTMAN'S CAESAR IN GAUL**

for about four years I am not at all hesitant in saying that I know of no other book I should prefer to use for the second year's work". Do you?

***Ginn and Company***

***70 Fifth Ave., New York***

## **What This Latin Teacher Finds**

"I find Place's Beginning Latin a very helpful textbook. The first year students find each new step first explained so well in English that they cannot help understanding. The list of English words given opposite each new vocabulary has helped the pupils to remember the new Latin word by associating it with the familiar English word.

"To show you that the pupils here like Place's book, I will tell you about the Caesar class. Whenever I assign any review for the Caesar class, in place of using their own Latin Grammars they borrow books from the first year Latin students as they say they can understand them better.

"I like Place's book because it is not as condensed as most texts".

*Many Other Teachers Write to the Same Effect*

Place's Beginning Latin .....	\$1.40
Place's Second Year Latin .....	\$1.68

By PERLEY OAKLAND PLACE, Litt.D., *Professor of Latin, Syracuse University.*

## **AMERICAN BOOK COMPANY**

NEW YORK

CINCINNATI

CHICAGO

BOSTON

ATLANTA

# The Classical Weekly

VOL. XVIII, No. 3

MONDAY, OCTOBER 20, 1924

WHOLE NO. 480

## THE ASSOCIATION GUILLAUME BUDÉ<sup>1</sup>

Our scholarly associations with France have not been so close as the historic bond with the land of Lafayette and of Rochambeau might have warranted; but this was perhaps due chiefly to certain restrictions laid upon foreign students in the French institutions of higher learning. This has now been adjusted, and our students are flocking more and more to Paris and to other French centers of scholarship. Because of this closer relationship, I wish to speak of an important movement among the French classicists, of great significance to scholars in other countries also.

In 1917, when the military situation was at its most discouraging point, certain French classicists determined that, whatever the outcome of the war, French classical scholarship should be restored to the proud position which it held at the time of the Renaissance. They accordingly formed an Association, to which they gave the name of Guillaume Budé (1468-1540), the remarkable French scholar who emancipated Greek and Latin studies from the domination of theology, and instituted the critical treatment of texts and the scientific study of word-meanings. As the first and chief means to their end, they projected a series of critical texts of Greek and Latin authors, with a translation into French. These are appearing in a series called *Collection des Universités de France*.

Every volume of the series is a new critical edition, independently prepared by its editor, and provided with a reasonable amount of critical apparatus; where the text tradition is notably corrupt or difficult, as is that of the poem *Aetna*, the volume is provided with a detailed apparatus. Thus the series is intended to compete successfully with the German Teubner texts and the English Oxford Classical Texts Series. The translations are rather free, but express the meaning of the original with extreme precision and with that flashing grace which is the characteristic of choice French; a few explanatory notes are placed at the bottom of the page. Every volume has a careful Introduction on the life and the works of the author, or, where his works are spread into several volumes, on the particular work merely.

The first volume to appear was one of Plato, containing the *Apology*, the *Crito*, and certain other dialogues, and was edited by the distinguished Maurice Croiset, President of the Association; the edition consisted of 5,000 copies, and was almost exhausted within three years. The next to appear was a *Lucretius*, in two volumes, by Professor Ernout, of Lille; this went into a second edition early in the present year.

<sup>1</sup>I called attention to this Association, and to some of its earliest publications, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 15.136, under the caption *A New French Series of Classical Texts*. C. K.

The third was *Persius*, by Professor Cartault, of Paris; in the complete form, this was quickly exhausted, though copies of the text alone and of the translation alone were to be had for a longer period. All told, about sixty volumes have been issued up to the present.

The plans of the Association include a complete series of texts and translations of Greek and Latin authors, and about sixty more volumes are already in preparation. Among the most notable will be an *Odyssey* in six volumes, three of text and translation, and three of commentary, by Professor Victor Bérard, director of studies at the *École des Hautes Études*, well known in this country as the author of *Les Phéniciens et l'Odysée*.

The Association has four other series, of which all but the last have to do with classical studies: *Collection d'Études Anciennes*, *Nouvelle Collection de Textes et Documents*, *Collection de Commentaires d'Auteurs Anciens*, *Collection de Littérature Générale*. A few volumes only have appeared in each of these; but it is worth noting that appearance in these is not limited to the productions of French scholars. The Association, organized under the lead especially of Maurice Croiset, the late Alfred Croiset, Louis Havet, the late Paul Girard, Paul Mazon, and others, who pressed dauntlessly ahead despite the lukewarmness and the scepticism of many, has been able to secure substantial support in many quarters. In April, 1923, it was recognized by the French government as "*établissement d'utilité publique*", which gave it the legal right to receive gifts and legacies. It is increasing its working-capital by retaining the profits which accrue from its publications. As a result of these growing capabilities, it plans to publish a certain number of works of high scholarly value, which can not find a publisher elsewhere because they will never be commercially profitable. And, it should be noted, the acceptance of any manuscript for publication by the Association takes place only after it has been critically examined and approved by one or more distinguished scholars to whom it has been referred.

The Association began in October, 1923, the publication of a quarterly *Bulletin*, which contains articles relating to its own work, articles of independent scholarly value, and a bibliography of current French publications in many fields—Greek and Latin literature, French literature, literary history and criticism, archaeology and epigraphy, linguistics, history, philosophy, religious and social studies. The last issue contained, for example, the first installment of a detailed study and history of the Capitoline Wolf, by J. Carcopino; also a notable appreciation of Basil Lanneau Gildersleeve, by Théodor Reinach. One might note that M. Reinach and eleven other members of the

Institute of France are on the directorate of the Association, a fact which in itself alone would demonstrate its high standing.

It would in any case be worth while to call the attention of American scholars to this important enterprise. M. Jean Malys, Délégué Général of the Association, last spring visited our country in its interests, and he assured me that his success far outstripped his hopes. Yet, though he addressed the spring meeting of The Classical Association of the Atlantic States, there must be many readers of THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY who did not hear his address, or might be glad to hear again about the Association's work. Moreover, a class of membership is open at a small cost, ten francs a year, which confers very considerable advantages. The member receives the quarterly Bulletin; he is entitled to twenty-five percent reduction on the list price of all publications of the Association; he may order through the Association such other French publications as he desires; he may enjoy the hospitality of the Association's Paris office and library as an intellectual center and meeting-place; he may secure, at moderate cost, aid and cooperation in research work, bibliographical service in the fields covered by the Bulletin, photographic and other reproductions of MSS. and of printed texts. The writer is authorized by M. Malys to receive and transmit dues of members, the sum of ten francs (about 55 cents) being too small for separate sending; and he will be glad to furnish any information at his command to anyone who is interested. He would add that the volumes of text and translation, with the discount for members, bound and inclusive of postage, average about one dollar in cost.

M. Malys hopes to visit America again in the early months of 1925, in the interests of the Association, and desires to secure some lecture appointments; he will lecture either in French or in English, on The Association Guillaume Budé, The National Emblems of France (Illustrated), The Interesting History of an Old French University, The University of Poitiers (Illustrated), French Political Life, Lorraine (Illustrated), The French Academy (Illustrated), Some Recent French Authors. On this matter also, the writer invites inquiries.

Those who prefer to write direct should address themselves to M. Jean Malys, Délégué Général, Association Guillaume Budé, 95 Boulevard Raspail, Paris VI<sup>e</sup>, France.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

ROLAND G. KENT

#### THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CLASSICAL TRAGEDY AND ROMANTIC TRAGEDY

The main differences between classical tragedy and romantic tragedy are differences in the status and the structure of the theaters, in the structure and technique of the plays themselves, in their spirit and their motive, and in their conceptions of art and of life.

One of the greatest differences is the difference in the construction and the purpose of the buildings in which these literary productions were presented and in the manner in which they were staged.

The Greek drama was both a national and a religious institution. The theater was in use only at stated times, for short periods; the plays were seldom repeated<sup>1</sup>. Consequently the theater-structure was built on vast dimensions, to accommodate the greater part of the population of Athens, and to admit of spectacular effects on a magnificent scale. The space for the structure was scooped out of the solid rock of the Acropolis. The actors faced the Parthenon-crowned Acropolis, and the spectators the honeyed Hymettus and the sunny-isled Aegean. The theater was open to the sky. Standing under the open sky in broad daylight, the actors could with great propriety address the powers of earth, and sea, and sky. Among the most pathetic and moving passages in the Greek tragedies are those in which some dying hero or heroine addresses those powers.

If one bears in mind the simplicity and yet the massiveness of the Greek theater, its means of direct appeal to nature and to the emotions, its nobleness of purpose, and its comprehensiveness, the attempts at dramatic performances in the Elizabethan Age seem very feeble. Yet that age produced the incomparable romantic drama of English literature, and out of its crude, uncouth, and rather unlovely conditions came most of the finest specimens of modern literary art.

The Elizabethan play-houses were wooden structures, usually without roofs<sup>2</sup>. They were modelled after courtyards of English inns, where performances were given before theaters were built. How much more appropriate it must have been to see Juno or Jupiter descend upon the Greek stage than upon the Elizabethan, as in *The Tempest* or in *Cymbeline*. The performance took place in the hazy sunlight of a late afternoon, and before an audience rude, misbehaved, and perchance only half sympathetic<sup>3</sup>.

The Greek tragic poets were constrained for the most part to confine themselves to a narrow circle of myths and legendary stories, dealing with gods and goddesses, heroes and heroines. The observance of this rule was due to the religious scruples and to the idealizing instincts of the Greeks<sup>4</sup>. The poets would handle the same theme again and again; they were permitted to expend their creative imagination on them just so long as they did not distort the main outline of the story.

The writer of romantic tragedy is under no such restrictions or obligations in the choice of subject-matter. The whole field of human events and human endeavor lies open to him. He may use facts as he pleases; he may even invent them; he may interpret them anew; or he may embody them in beings of his own flesh and blood. He may even mingle the serious and the comic and produce tragic-comedy, like *Hamlet*, or serious comedy, like *Measure for Measure*.

This mingling of tragic and comic elements reveals

<sup>1</sup>In the Golden Age of the Greek tragedy, 250 poets produced, it is said, 3,400 plays: see J. D. Quackenbush, *Ancient Literature, Oriental and Classical*, 194 (New York, Harpers, 1886).

<sup>2</sup>Edward Dowden, *Introduction to Shakespeare*, 47-50 (New York, 1896).

<sup>3</sup>J. A. Symonds, *Shakespeare's Predecessors in the English Drama*, 289.

<sup>4</sup>A. E. Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, 328-333.



another noticeable difference between the two types of tragedy. "According to the prevailing Greek custom, the distinction between tragedy and comedy was rigorously accentuated"<sup>5</sup>. The *Alcestis*, is, of course, an exception, but virtually a solitary one. It is really a new kind of drama. In it the tragic and the comic incidents and elements are so mingled that they produce a "faithful representation of the checkered character of human existence".

Aristotle, in his *Poetics*, Sidney, in his *Defense of Poesy*, Milton, in the preface to his *Samson Agonistes*, and Ben Jonson, in the critical introductions to his plays, are all strenuously opposed to the mingling of tragedy and comedy, because it lacks, they say, good judgment and refinement of taste.

But the writers of the Elizabethan plays scattered comic scenes up and down the pages of the greatest tragedies<sup>6</sup>. Shakespeare has been criticized for introducing ribald clowns, grave-diggers, and undignified porters into the stately and serious scenes of *King Lear*, *Hamlet*, and *Macbeth*. But the Elizabethan dramatists pictured life as they found it; they recorded the facts of life. With the possible exception of the plays of Euripides there are no facts in the writings of the ancient tragic poets any more than there are facts in music.

Further, in Greek tragedy, no deed of violence could be enacted on the stage<sup>7</sup>. Sophocles made a bold departure in presenting to the audience Ajax falling upon his sword. No reason can be assigned for Sophocles's departure from the fixed custom; nor can any but conjectures be offered to explain the banishing of deeds of violence from the stage<sup>8</sup>.

The only other example of such realism in a Greek tragedy is found in the *Suppliants* of Euripides, in which Evadne hurls herself from a rock upon her husband's funeral pyre. It might be worth noting that both these incidents are cases of suicide. Does the fixity of the rule, then, hinge on such a trivial matter as the number of persons involved? On most other occasions the harrowing details are narrated by a messenger who witnessed the events<sup>9</sup>.

In the romantic tragic plays deeds of violence often take place on the stage. In *Titus Andronicus* thirteen of the *dramatis personae* are killed on the stage! Kyd's *Spanish Tragedy* is smeared all over with gore and filled with gruesome scenes. In *Othello* we see the hero smother Desdemona. We see Brutus stab Caesar; we witness poisoning and stabbing in *Romeo and Juliet*. On the other hand, no deeds of violence are committed on the Stage in *Pericles*, or in *Macbeth*, or in Shelly's *Cenci*, the most consummate tragedy since the time of Shakespeare. Nor is there any such act in Schiller's *Maria Stuart*, etc.

Again, only conjectures can be offered for this variation in the practice. But could the slaughter of Agamemnon be made more horrifying and tragically effective on the stage than it is made to be behind the stage by

the slow, halting, and almost exasperating deliberation of the Chorus, emphasized by the prophetic vision of Cassandra? And all the while the cries of Agamemnon fill the theater. In the *Orestes*, we hear the cries of Helen, but no one, not even the Chorus, knows what is taking place behind the stage. Which is the more horrifying and dramatic—things unseen but heard, or things unheard but seen?

The unity of action is probably the only one of the three principles of dramaturgy that is universal. This is mainly so because it springs from the inmost nature of a play. Aristotle places plot first and character second. The Greek poets observed this rule to the farthest limit; in fact they could hardly violate it, had they wished to do so. Their subjects were limited and simple; they were also well known to the audience. No attempt was made at explanation, because none was necessary; even the title of the play would indicate the nature of the performance. The romantic dramatist, however, loves to linger over the opening scenes and incidents in order to show the 'why' and the 'wherefore' of the circumstances, and in this way lead up to the grand climax, whereas the ancient writer would begin with the climax and show it in all its power and vividness.

Shakespeare may at times disregard this principle of dramaturgy in form, but no less often does his fiery imagination restore it in spirit. *Macbeth* opens in Murrayland, near Forres, where the witches appear on the heath; the murder of Duncan takes place in the Castle of Inverness; and Macduff slays Macbeth in Dunsinane Castle near the Tay. The scene changes from Scotland to England, and the time represented on the stage covers nine days. But the incidents are so crowded and the movement is so rapid that one forgets all about the principles of construction.

The unity of place is not mentioned by Aristotle. There is a difference of opinion as to its observance<sup>10</sup>.

The Greek poets seem to have violated it about as often as they observed it. The most familiar instances of its violation are found in the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus and in the *Ajax* of Sophocles. In the former the scene changes from Delphi to Athens, in the latter from the camp to a lonely spot near the sea-coast.

The observance of the unity of place may have been a matter of course rather than a wilful choice. Very little opportunity was afforded to the Greek poets to change the place of action. The Chorus was virtually always present and the curtain never fell. Furthermore, their plays are very short and of a highly concentrated action; the shortness of the play does not demand a change, and the highly concentrated action does not permit of one. An illustration may be found in the *Prometheus Bound*. To this tragedy the sprawling scenes of Antony and Cleopatra or those of *Pericles* afford a striking contrast. Those of *Pericles* are scattered all over Asia Minor; the action takes place in six different cities, and there are fourteen changes of scene.

The Greek dramatists, it seems, took considerable

<sup>5</sup>Haigh, *The Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, 223.

<sup>6</sup>Compare e. g. Preston, *Cambises*.

<sup>7</sup>R. G. Moulton, *The Ancient Classical Drama*, 38-39.

<sup>8</sup>J. A. Symonds, *Studies of the Greek Poets*, 2, 151-153.

<sup>9</sup>Compare e. g. Aeschylus, *Persae*; Euripides, *Bacchae*.

<sup>10</sup>A. E. Haigh, *Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, 340, versus R. C. Flickinger, *The Greek Theater and its Drama*, 247.

latitude with the element of time. Unity of time was not originally a law of Greek tragedy. We are told by Aristotle that the early dramas were free from chronological limitations; they were in the main often only lyrical performances with a little monologue interspersed; there was not much genuine representation of an action. But gradually the idea may have suggested itself of making the 'imitation' more exact by having the duration of the play and the supposed duration of the story at least approximate. As the importance of the Chorus in consequence of this idea became gradually less, tragedy became more dramatic and more like a series of events occurring before the eyes; by limiting the events to the period of a single day the poets made the illusion greater<sup>11</sup>.

This view may be verified by examining the plays of Aeschylus. It is well known that in his dramas the Chorus plays the most conspicuous part, for the lyric and the tragic had not yet been so clearly differentiated as they were later. In his plays, the supposed duration of the story extends beyond a single day—the unit of time according to later classic usage. Surely his *Persae* and his *Agamemnon* would require much more time. In all subsequent extant plays there are only two instances<sup>12</sup> in which the rule is not observed, and these involve but slight violations.

It is doubtful whether the same can be said of romantic tragedy as a whole. Nothing can describe this particular point better than a quotation from Sir Philip Sidney<sup>13</sup>.

Now of time they are much more liberal. For ordinary it is that two young princes fall in love; after many traverses she is got with child, delivered of a fair boy, he is lost, groweth a man, falleth in love, and is ready to get another child, and all this in two hours' space.

Compare also Whetstone<sup>14</sup>:

"... in three hours runs he <the Englishman> through the world, marries, gets children, makes children men, men conquer kingdoms, murder monstres, and bringeth gods from heaven and devils from hell.

In Shakespeare's *Winter's Tale*, between the fourth and the fifth acts, there is an interval of sixteen years, which time is supposed to be sufficient to admit of Perdita's growing up from a baby into a marriageable girl. This romantic drama marks the final overthrow of the hallowed unity of time.

One of the most striking differences between classic and romantic tragedy lies in the handling of the Chorus. In Greek tragedy its members were deeply interested in passing events. And, though they took no particular part in the action of the play<sup>15</sup>, they seldom left the stage. It was part of their function to deduce moral reflections from the incidents of the play, to give counsel to the leading characters, and to sing odes during the intermissions. When they did take part in the dialogue, the appointed leader acted as spokesman for his companions. Their main duty, however, was the performance of the Choral ode and dance. The Chorus seems to have been a kind of

ideal spectator who connected the performance with the outside world.

In the earlier romantic tragedies the Chorus sometimes supplied the deficiency of the action by offering an explanation or moral reflections on the happenings<sup>16</sup>. The relation which the Chorus had to the rest of a Greek tragedy may be learned from Milton's *Samson Agonistes*. Again, in Gray's *Bard*, which would form a noble opening to a tragedy based on the career of Edward II, the features of a choral ode can be seen.

The metrical flexibility in variation of tone and movement in the ancient drama was furnished by the Chorus. The modern drama attains practically the same results by the alternate use of prose and verse. Some of the lyrical element of Greek tragedy has been retained in the setting of modern tragedy in the music which fills the intervals between scenes and acts. In ancient tragedy the lyrical element at first almost absorbed the dramatic; in the *Agamemnon* the Chorus takes up 514 lines out of 1,650, or more than one-third of the entire play; and these 514 lines do not include the passages in which the Chorus takes part in the dialogue. In dealing with tragedy modern writers seek to avoid this danger by dividing dramatic performances into the play proper and the opera. But this division also has its disadvantages; by omitting the chorus, the scenery, and the decorations, and most of the music of a Greek play, a modern play falls short of the beauty, the harmony, and the perfection which characterize all Greek art wherever it manifests itself.

In classical tragedy the language is brief and condensed; the plays, have, therefore, a quality of compactness which adds to their massiveness and colossal grandeur. The ancient tragic poets convey the most violent passions in the simplest language. Classical tragedy is simple. Its characters are few, and its plots not intricate; some of the tragedies have no plot at all. No sub-plots are found. Many modern writers, taking a classical theme, have added a sub-plot, usually with a bad effect. Dryden's *Oedipus*, with its audacious sub-plot, seems almost farcical and incongruous when compared with Sophocles's noble play with its one central figure. Goethe's *Iphigenie auf Tauris*, with its element of romantic love and its mixture of ancient scenery and modern sentiment, is a literary curiosity rather than a great play.

The writers of modern tragedy are more diffuse, restless, and uneasy; they often lack repose, because they aim at the unattainable; and so they indulge in inflated language and in exaggeration. With them every breeze is a whirlwind, and every sensation is an ecstasy; and so their language and sentiment frequently fail to harmonize. Plots they construct on inadequate themes, and incidents of extreme horror and wickedness are worked into a tragedy whose situations are hardly to be produced by any possible means. It is also difficult for the romantic poets to make their characters speak their own thoughts; the poets are very apt to come themselves before the spectator and make comments in impassioned demonstrations. Classical

<sup>11</sup>Haigh, *Tragic Drama of the Greeks*, 340.

<sup>12</sup>The *Trachiniae* of Sophocles and the *Suppliants* of Euripides.

<sup>13</sup>Defense of Poesy, 48 (Ginn and Co., 1890).

<sup>14</sup>J. P. Collier, *English Dramatic Poetry*, 2, 422 (London, 1831).

<sup>15</sup>It may be necessary to except the plays of Aeschylus.

<sup>16</sup>Henry V, Pericles, Dr. Faustus, Gorboduc, James IV.

tragedy shows selfsuppression; romantic tragedy shows selfreflection.

Greek tragedy is inspired by the agency of Fate, or Destiny. This statement is often challenged, and it is likewise denied that Destiny obliterated character and made man a victim of blind Fate. But it cannot be denied that the gods were the agents of Destiny, and that they were the controlling forces in all nature and life. The people who move through classical tragedy consequently lack that tragic motive which can arise only out of an inward liberty coming in conflict with external necessity. Such ideas as the Greeks held of the universe gave to their life a somber background over which blows a breath of fatalism; and this very breath blows over their tragedy. In romantic tragedy man is given the opportunity to exercise freedom of choice; he is put in charge of circumstance (compare Macbeth or Hamlet), and is left to himself to work out his own salvation.

The position of woman in Greek society made the Greek tragic poets miss the refining influence of woman—one of the most fertile themes of tragedy. Romantic love, the staple of the modern novel and the modern drama, was almost wholly unknown to the classical tragic poets. The nearest approach to romantic love in the extant classical tragedies is the love between Haemon and Antigone. But, even here, it is subordinate to the State and to divine law. Euripides has given some tender scenes of conjugal and sisterly love; he comes very close to the subject of romantic love in his *Hippolytus*. But the love which these writers depicted has hardly any resemblance to the passion of the same name which arose simultaneously with chivalry in modern Europe. Too often do the classical writers represent love as a fervor, or a fit of insanity, and not as something like that refined and ennobling love which existed between Romeo and Juliet.

The spiritual content of classical and romantic tragedy offers another remarkable point of difference. Classical tragedy is pervaded with the conception of the retribution which identifies the ruling power of the universe with justice. The evil-doing of one generation lived on into successive generations until retributive justice had overtaken the supposed transgressor. A wrong done had to be righted and a sin committed had to be punished somewhere, sometime, by the higher powers.

Modern tragedy has no such idea or purpose; it does not endeavor to inject moral or religious truths into the domain of art. Its object is "to hold, as 'twere, the mirror up to nature; to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure"<sup>17</sup>, in order to bring before the spectator, or reader, scenes of human life from which he may draw lessons in the light of his own experience and existence.

Consequently, romantic tragedy exhibits scenes of human life that arouse sympathy and terror, scenes of innocent misery which arouse our indignation as well as our pity. It shows Lear struggling with his unnatu-

ral daughters, and the Duchess of Malfi with an unnatural brother; it shows Desdemona as the victim of deceitfully wrought jealousy and slain without any opportunity at an explanation; it shows Faust tormenting Margaret, and Hamlet, Ophelia, and Romeo and Juliet slain in the springtime of their love. From such incidents one may verily draw lessons in the light of one's own experience.

The purpose of tragedy is to excite universal sympathy for an ideal sorrow and to give expression and relief to the emotions. And this is what Greek tragedy accomplished; it brought about a reconciliation of human and divine will and power. It gives one the feeling that, after the strife and contest of human aspirations with divine ordination, the eternal counsels of the ruler of the universe remain unchanged. The will of Prometheus is finally absorbed in that of Zeus; Antigone brings a message of joy and peace to her parents in Hades; and the trilogy of Orestes ends with a benediction upon the man who redeemed his house.

But wherein lies the purification and the pacification of our emotions in romantic tragedy, or in the romantic novel? How much does one feel relieved after he has read *King Lear*, *Faust*, *Dr. Faustus*, *Othello*, *Hamlet*, *The Book of Job*, or even *Kenilworth*? The gospel of the feebleness of human effort preached by George Eliot thwarts rather than spurs human effort; and too many of the romantic tragedies end in the silence of the grave. Why is this? Because classical art was satisfied with the finite, within whose limits it sought to attain perfection. But romantic art is satisfied with nothing short of the infinite; it strives after a completion and perfection which are impossible of attainment, because the very nature of modern life does not have a resting-place for the Christian mind, whose spiritual horizon has been widened by the realization that "...through the ages one increasing purpose runs"<sup>18</sup>. In the effort to follow that purpose lie the restlessness and the tragedy of human life.

Finally, the chief differences between classical and romantic tragedy have their sources in the different conceptions of life entertained by the ancient and the modern worlds. These differences may have been brought about mainly by Christianity, because it greatly deepened the mystery of life; it suggested that there is something behind this world of sense, and so it quickly turned the mystery of the Greek world into the mysticism of the modern. The Greeks identified mind with matter; hence their fine sense of harmony and proportion, and their assurance and contentment. But this idea of harmony has been destroyed for the modern world and mind, for mind has stepped outside of matter, and, looking back at its course, has begun to reflect whence it came. The individual has discovered himself.

Despite its unlovely and unpromising origin, romantic tragedy has enriched both life and literature, and "has helped to fill some dull blanks with love and knowledge". It is more inspiring, it is fuller and rounder; it takes a broader and deeper view of life.

<sup>17</sup>Hamlet, 3.2.27.

<sup>18</sup>Tennyson, *Locksley Hall*.



It sacrificed form for matter; it added strangeness to beauty, doubt to faith, mystery to certainty, and love to reverence.

NORTHEAST HIGH SCHOOL,  
PHILADELPHIA

E. SCHULTZ GERHARD

## REVIEWS

Greek Religious Thought from Homer to the Age of Alexander. By F. M. Cornford. New York: E. P. Dutton and Co. (1923). Pp. xxxv + 252.

A Primer of Greek Thought. By Foster Partridge Boswell. Geneva, New York: W. F. Humphrey (1923). Pp. vii + 175.

History of Greek Philosophy—Thales to Democritus. By B. A. G. Fuller. New York: Henry Holt and Co. (1923). Pp. xii + 290.

These three works may properly be grouped together because they treat, at least in part, the same matter, though they present it differently and are of unequal merit.

(1) Mr. Cornford's book belongs to The Library of Greek Thought, edited by Ernest Barker, of which several volumes have been published<sup>1</sup>. Its scope is defined by its title, and Mr. Cornford explains its purpose in these words (Introduction, vii):

The purpose of this book is to let the English reader see for himself what the Greeks, from Homer to Aristotle, thought about the world, the gods and their relations to man, the nature and destiny of the soul, and the significance of human life. The form of presentation is prescribed by the plan of the series. The book is to be a compilation of extracts from the Greek authors, selected, so far as possible, without prejudice and translated with such honesty as a translation may have. This plan has the merit of isolating the actual thought of the Greeks in this period from all the constructions put upon it by later ages, except in so far as the choice of extracts must be governed by some scheme in the compiler's mind, which is itself determined by the limits of his knowledge and by other personal factors. In the book itself it is clearly his business to reduce the influence of these factors to the lowest point; but in the Introduction it is no less his business to forewarn the reader against some of the consequences.

The Introduction, of about twenty pages, is thoroughly judicious, and serves its legitimate purpose admirably. It does not, of course, pretend to give a history of Greek religious thought, but calls attention to matters, on the whole important, which seemed to the compiler to deserve notice. It is safe to say that no two scholars would agree on the things to be singled out for special emphasis; consequently criticism is really not in place. One may say that the general limits set for "religious" thought are likewise judiciously determined, though here also everything depends on the definition of religion, on which there can be no general agreement. Fortunately the series calls for the exposition of religious thought, not religion; for the former may be presented in extracts from the literature, chiefly the higher literature, of the Greeks, while

an important—probably the more important—part of Greek religion cannot be so presented. Greek religion, like most religions of the ancient world, consisted in great part of ritual acts, which had indeed their counterpart in thought; but the immediate consciousness accompanying the act of worship, which I regard as the most significant aspect of religion, even of religious thought, is hardly to be learned from reflective literature. What one gets is something akin to theology, which is always a different thing, and may be non-religious or even irreligious, since it possesses nothing of the spirit of worship. An intensive study of the ritual may recover many suggestions which came to the devotee in the act of worshipping his gods, and so reveal the most significant religious thought; but that, as has already been said, cannot be done by collecting extracts from the higher, reflective literature of a people, nor can it be done in a popular handbook. Of course, Mr. Cornford, who has shown his competence in such matters in his previous studies (From Religion to Philosophy, The Origin of Attic Comedy, and his chapter on the Olympic Games in Miss Harrison's *Themis*), is quite well aware of this.

Regarding the illustrations of Greek religious thought which Mr. Cornford has selected, every student of the subject will naturally differ from the compiler, because he will miss many a passage which he thinks ought to have been included; but, if he should proceed to enumerate the omissions he deplores, he will doubtless discover that others disagree with him as much as they do with Mr. Cornford, and he will presently find that he has trespassed the reasonable limits of space to be given to the subject. It seems to me that, considering the practical problem proposed to the compiler, he has solved it very well. The translations, partly his own, partly taken from standard works, are on the whole thoroughly satisfactory. Here and there, as in the description of the Olympian Zeus of Phidias, later authors had to be quoted: this is commendable, when, as in this instance, there is no obvious coloring of later thought. But it is possible to doubt the wisdom of quoting Iamblichus and Diogenes Laertius (65-68) for the thought of Pythagoras. However, this is a minor matter. The book as a whole is excellent.

(2) In Professor Boswell's *Primer of Greek Thought*, I regret to say, I can find nothing to praise, unless it be the good-will toward a worthy subject that prompted him to write it.

(3) Dr. Fuller's *History of Greek Philosophy—Thales to Democritus* is of larger caliber. The author says of it (Preface, x):

This volume is based upon other histories, and so far as I know, there is nothing original in it. The sources have been before me, but I have tried to rely entirely upon the interpretation of them given by such historians as, for instance, Zeller, Gomperz, and Professor Burnet. I do not see that at the present time anything new can be said, except by experts, and it has been my aim merely to rehash in a lighter and more easily digested form what they have already thrashed out and prepared.

This is certainly frank and disarming. It is not quite fair, however, to take the book at its author's valu-

<sup>1</sup>One volume of this Library, *Greek Economics*, by M. L. W. Laistner, was reviewed, by Professor W. L. Westermann, in *THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY* 17.144. C. K.



ation; for it does contain, if not things quite original, some things not to be found in the historians of Greek philosophy. Moreover, Dr. Fuller has done on the whole very well what he proposed to do, and in important matters he has presented the views of those on whom he relied so faithfully that any criticism of his account lies against them rather than against him. In selecting his authorities on individual points he has proceeded intelligently, though one can hardly be expected always to agree with him even on the plane he deliberately chooses. The result is a usable book, which might well be tried with a class.

WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY

W. A. HEIDEL

Korakou: A Prehistoric Settlement near Corinth. By Carl W. Blegen. Published by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. Boston and New York (1921). Pp. xv + 139.

The geographical position of Corinth at the end of the narrow isthmus joining Greece and the Peloponnese assured its importance in relation to its neighbors from the time of its earliest settlement. The fertility of the low-lying fields, reaching on one side to the Corinthian Gulf and on the other to the Saronic Gulf, furnished a promise of generous livelihood to the inhabitants, whose protection was guaranteed by the sloping hills which culminate in the impregnable heights of Acro-Corinth. The richness of Corinthian mythological tradition affirms the conspicuous importance of the district in prehistoric times. Yet the 'wealthy Corinth' of Homeric reference has never yet been successfully lured by the inquisitive archaeologist to surrender any secrets of its uncertain past.

Although the chief settlement of prehistoric and Homeric days, which must have existed in the vicinity of the citadel, has not yet been discovered, Dr. Blegen's keen eye has disclosed several small prehistoric settlements, located on low hills not far distant from the site of the city of the classical period. Korakou, one of these outlying settlements, is the subject of the book under review.

The name Korakou is applied to a hillock about three kilometers west of New Corinth, on which Dr. Blegen made excavations for a short period in 1915 and in 1916. The surface deposit of a depth of four to five meters was found to show undisturbed stratification, in which three distinct strata were distinguished by characteristic types of pottery. As is usual in the case of prehistoric sites, the main evidence for community changes and even for successive habitations is supplied by humble pottery, and therefore it is not surprising that more than two-thirds of the descriptive matter of this book is devoted to the study of the vases.

The various periods determined by observation of the stratifications are designated by the generic term Helladic, in order to distinguish prehistoric civilization on the Greek mainland from that found on the Cyclades Islands (Cycladic), and from that on Crete (Minoan). In spite of this regrettable multiplication of terms for almost contemporaneous periods of time the resultant clarity of geographical delimitation

justifies the enlargement of the nomenclature. After the manner instituted by Sir Arthur Evans in Crete the mainland civilization is subdivided into three great periods called Early, Middle, and Late Helladic, each of which is then subject to further subdivision. In the conclusion of the book, on page 121, is given a "table of synchronisms" of the three civilizations, in which their relative periodology is graphically presented. On page 123 approximate dates are assigned to the Helladic periods, as follows: Early Helladic, 2500-2000 B. C.; Middle Helladic, 2000-1600 B. C.; Late Helladic, 1600-1100 B. C.

Although this absolute chronology is only approximate, the actual development by periods on the site itself is proved by the evidence of the pottery. The first period is characterized by "urfnris" ware; the second by Minyan and matt-painted ware, and the third by Mycenaean ware. While the term "urfnris" is deliberately retained by Wace and Thompson in their book on Prehistoric Thessaly (page 21), it has no place in an English book and has been properly translated in Dr. Blegen's table. From the mass of nearly one hundred thousand potsherds more than one hundred and fifty vases were put together and restored, of which the more important in shape, color, and decoration are illustrated by colored plates made from water-colors by E. Gilliéron, Jr. These plates are admirably made both by the artist and by the engraver, and give a vivid impression of the original, such as no description can convey.

The chapter (III) devoted to architecture discusses the ground plans of several houses of the Middle and Late Helladic periods. The most interesting of these, which is shown on page 77, is a house of megaron type, terminating in an apse at the north end, which dates from the Middle Helladic age. The houses were built of unbaked bricks laid on stone foundations. This method of construction was employed throughout the occupation of the site.

Two burials of the Middle Helladic period were found on the hillock, and also three graves dating from Late Helladic times, but the contents were few and of minor importance.

This work by Dr. Blegen is a model of a small excavation accomplished with a maximum of results for a minimum of expense of time and money. The discoveries have been intelligently studied, both intrinsically and in their multiple relationships, and the publication has been completed without delay and in adequate and praiseworthy form.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THEODORE LESLIE SHEAR

Motya, A Phoenician Colony in Sicily. By Joseph I. S. Whitaker. With Numerous Illustrations, Plans and Maps. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd. (1921). Pp. xvi + 357. 10 sh.

The town of Marsala in Western Sicily has achieved wide repute as the home of the luscious fruit of the vine that bears its name. The name Whitaker is indissolubly associated with the gracious flavor of Marsala. It is agreeably appropriate that the present

worthy representative of the English family that had large part in the development and the distribution of the delicious beverage should have become interested in the early history of the district of which he is so intimate a part. It is most gratifying from the point of view of science that this interest has led to the prosecution of archaeological investigations that have already produced important results.

There were three major Phoenician settlements in Sicily—Motya, Solous, and Panormus. Of the two latter no ruins or remains exist or have yet been discovered that date from the period of Phoenician occupation. Therefore the ruins of Motya acquire an added importance. Although Pausanias is a dissenting witness, modern writers are in general accord in recognizing as correct the identification of the Phoenician settlement with the ruins on the small island of San Pantaleo, lying just north of Lilybaeum, the modern Marsala. On this island was a small hamlet surrounded by numerous subdivided fields which acknowledged a much diversified proprietorship, so that it was only by the expenditure of considerable time and the practice of great patience that the author was enabled to acquire the terrain preparatory to making the excavations which have resulted in the present book.

The work is divided into two parts, of which the first is historical and the second archaeological. In the first part is given a well written resumé of the Phoenician movement in the Mediterranean and of the practice by this people of founding colonies for trading purposes in all the sea-coast lands. The identification of the site of Motya is thoroughly established and the history of the town is recounted in great detail. Of the utmost archaeological importance is the fact that the town was captured and destroyed by Dionysius of Syracuse in 397 B. C., and was never afterwards rebuilt or reoccupied. Thus a terminus ante quem is here provided for the study of all chronological problems such as are invariably associated with the results of excavations.

The scope of the first part of the book may be most satisfactorily indicated by the citation of the captions of the several chapters: Phoenicia and the Phoenicians; Phoenician Cities and Colonies; Sicily and its Earlier Inhabitants; The Phoenicians in Sicily; The Greeks in Sicily; The Siege and Fall of Motya; Motya after its Fall: Lilybaeum its Successor.

The archaeological investigations on the island are described in Part 2 of the work, and the last chapter (VIII) of this part contains a more detailed account of the particular objects found, presented in the form of a catalogue of the Motya Museum, as the antiquities are at present housed in a small building erected for the purpose on the site itself.

Mr. Whitaker began the actual archaeological work in 1906 under the supervision of the Italian authorities, as required by the Italian law. A preliminary report of the early results was published by Professor Pace, in *Notizie Degli Scavi*, 1915, 431 ff. The researches were

directed along two main lines: the tracing of the circuit fortification walls, and the excavation of tombs.

The literary accounts of the long siege of Motya by Dionysius emphasize the strength of the defensive walls of the island. The archaeological investigations have verified these descriptions. Traces of the walls have been found about the entire island, except here and there where the cliff itself has been undermined and washed away by the action of the sea. At various points in the walls remains were uncovered of elaborate structures, such as stairs, gateways, and towers. Of considerable interest is the determination of successive periods of occupation by the size and the material of the stones, and by the manner of the construction.

However, as often occurs in the excavation of ancient sites, the most important discoveries were made in the cemeteries. Early burials of the eighth and seventh centuries were uncovered on the island, while on the mainland opposite was located the later and main cemetery, with burials ranging in date from the end of the seventh century to the time of the fall of the city in 397 B. C. In the earlier necropolis the ashes of the dead, after cremation, were placed either in large terra cotta jars or in small stone chests, while on the mainland inhumation was the custom and the bodies were deposited in sarcophagi. Occasionally rude and simple stelae were discovered in connection with the ash urns on the island, and almost without exception small vases were lying about them. Many of these vases are of dull unglazed yellowish clay, and may have been of local manufacture. But imported wares also were found in abundance, of which the Proto-Corinthian and Corinthian vases are particularly useful for furnishing chronological data.

In addition to the pottery other objects usually present in tombs were discovered here also. There were articles of jewelry, weapons, spear and lance heads, and in the earlier tombs fragments of flint and obsidian. Many of these discoveries, all of which are deposited in the Motya Museum, are illustrated by photographs reproduced in the text. But unfortunately the reproductions are poorly made and many of the figures of the pottery are far from clear. Some of the descriptive titles of the pictures, too, are not to be readily understood. For example, the three Corinthian vases shown in Figure 85 are described as "Proto-Corinthian or Early Greek". I do not know if these terms are meant to be synonymous, or if an alternative is offered, but certainly the vases have no Proto-Corinthian characteristic, by whatever name that group of vases may be designated.

The partial excavation of Motya has produced important results; its continuation should yield much additional valuable material. Archaeologists are greatly indebted to Mr. Whitaker for the zeal and learning which planned and conducted the excavations, and for the literary charm that has presented the results in such an adequate and readable form.

PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

THEODORE LESLIE SHEAR